arXiv:0802.4260v2 [math.FA] 20 Oct 2008

HYPERCONTRACTIVITY FOR LOG-SUBHARMONIC FUNCTIONS

PIOTR GRACZYK$^{(1)}$, TODD KEMP$^{(2)}$, JEAN-JACQUES LOEB$^{(1)}$, AND TOMASZ ŻAK$^{(3)}$

ABSTRACT. We prove strong hypercontractivity (SHC) inequalities for logarithmically subharmonic functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and different classes of measures: Gaussian measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$, symmetric Bernoulli and symmetric uniform probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$, as well as their convolutions. Surprisingly, a slightly weaker strong hypercontractivity property holds for *any* symmetric measure on $\mathbb{R}$. For all measures on $\mathbb{R}$ for which we know the (SHC) holds, we prove that a log–Sobolev inequality holds in the log-subharmonic category with a constant *smaller* than the one for Gaussian measure in the classical context. This result is extended to all dimensions for compactly-supported measures.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we prove some important inequalities – strong hypercontractivity (SHC) and a logarithmic Sobolev inequality – for logarithmically subharmonic functions (cf. Definition 2.1 below.) Our paper is inspired by work of Janson [17], in which he began the study of an important property of semigroups called **strong hypercontractivity**. A rich series of subsequent papers by Janson [18], Carlen [3], Zhao [24], and recently by Gross ([10, 11] and a survey [12]) was devoted to this subject on the spaces $\mathbb{C}^n$ and, in papers by Gross, on complex manifolds. In contrast to all the aforementionned papers, our results concern the real spaces $\mathbb{R}^n$.

In the first part of the paper (Sections 3–4) we prove strong hypercontractivity in the log–subharmonic setting: for $0 < p \leq q < \infty$,

$$\|T_t f\|_{L^q(\mu)} \leq \|f\|_{L^p(\mu)} \quad \text{for} \quad t \geq \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{q}{p} \tag{SHC}$$

for the dilation semigroup $T_t f(x) = f(e^{-t}x)$, for any logarithmically subharmonic function f, for different classes of measures μ: including Gaussian measures and some compactly supported measures on $\mathbb{R}$ (symmetric Bernoulli and uniform probability measure on $[-a, a]$ for $a > 0$). We also show that, in numerous important cases, the convolution of two measures satisfying (SHC) also satisfies (SHC).

Let us note that in the theory of hypercontractivity for general measures, the semigroup considered is the one associated to the measure by the usual technology of Dirichlet forms. The generator of the semigroup (on a complete Riemannian manifold) takes the form $-\Delta + X$ where Δ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator and X is a vector field; hence, the semigroup restricted to *harmonic functions* on the manifold is simply the (backward) flow of X. For Gaussian measure, $X = x \cdot \nabla$, yielding the above flow T_t; this vector field is often called the *Euler operator*, denoted E. In a sense, the point of this paper is to show that the strong hypercontractivity theorems about this flow extend beyond harmonic functions to the larger class of logarithmically subharmonic functions.

In the second part of the paper (Section 5) we show that a log–Sobolev inequality (LSI) in the log–subharmonic domain holds for Gaussian measure on $\mathbb{R}$ and for all 1-dimensional measures which satisfy the strong hypercontractivity (SHC) considered in the first part. We also prove the general implication (SHC) ⇒ (LSI) for compactly supported measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$, still for log–subharmonic functions. In both cases, the (LSI) we get is *stronger* than the classical one in the following sense. Let

$$t_N(p,q) = \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{q-1}{p-1}, \quad t_J(p,q) = \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{q}{p}$$

Date: October 20, 2008.

(2) This work was partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-0701162.

denote the Nelson and Janson times (cf. [21, 17]), for $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ (in fact, t_J makes sense for all positive $p \leq q$). The classical hypercontractivity for $t \geq c\,t_N$ is equivalent, by Gross's theorem in [9], to a logarithmic-Sobolev inequality with the constant $2c$:

$$\int |f|^2 \log |f|^2 d\mu - \|f\|_{2,\mu}^2 \log \|f\|_{2,\mu}^2 \leq 2c \int fLf\,d\mu$$

where L is the positive generator of the semigroup. We show that, in the category of logarithmically subharmonic functions, the strong hypercontractivity for $t \geq c\,t_J$ implies (LSI) with *constant* c:

$$\int |f|^2 \log |f|^2 d\mu - \|f\|_{2,\mu}^2 \log \|f\|_{2,\mu}^2 \leq c \int fEf\,d\mu \tag{LSI}$$

where E is the Euler operator discussed above. Hence, one cannot obtain this stronger LSI by simply restricting the classical Gaussian LSI to log–subharmonic functions.

Let us note that the implication (SHC) $\Rightarrow$ (LSI) in the log–subharmonic case does not follow as easily as in the classical setting. Indeed, if f is log–subharmonic, the functions $f|_{[-N,N]}$ and $f\mathbf{1}_{|f|<N}$ are not log–subharmonic on $\mathbb{R}$, and the classical techniques of approximation by more regular (e.g. compactly supported or bounded) functions fail. Instead, the present approach is to approximate probability measures (e.g. Gaussian measures) by measures with compact support. This requires proving some stronger versions of the DeMoivre–Laplace Central Limit Theorem. These results, contained in Section 5.3, are interesting independently.

Our principal reference for the basic preliminaries is the book [1] which gives a very accessible survey on hypercontractivity and on logarithmic–Sobolev inequalities.

Acknowledgment. We thank A. Hulanicki for calling the attention of the first and third authors to hypercontractivity problems in the holomorphic category. Thanks also go to L. Gross for many helpful conversations.

2. LOG–SUBHARMONIC FUNCTIONS

Definition 2.1. An L^1_{loc} upper semi-continuous function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to [-\infty, +\infty)$, not identically equal to $-\infty$, is called **subharmonic** if for every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, one has the inequality:

$$f(x) \leq ⨍_{O(n)} f(x + \alpha y)\, d\alpha \tag{2.1}$$

where $O(n)$ is the orthogonal group of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $d\alpha$ is the normalized Haar measure on it. (The notation $⨍$ is a reminder that the measure in question is normalized.) A non-negative function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, +\infty)$ is called **log–subharmonic** (abbreviated LSH) if the function $\log g$ is subharmonic.

Remark 2.1. Definition 2.1 is evidently equivalent to insisting that $f(x) \leq ⨍_{\partial B(x,r)} f(t)\,\sigma(dt)$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\partial B(x,r)$ is the sphere of radius r about the point x, and σ is normalized Lebesgue measure on this sphere. Frequently, subharmonicity is stated in terms of averages over solid balls $B(x,r)$ instead; the two approaches are equivalent for L^1_{loc} upper-semicontinuous functions. Subharmonic function (and ergo log-subharmonic functions) need not have very good local properties. There are subharmonic functions that are discontinuous everywhere (see, for example, [23]). In some of what follows, it will be convenient to work with *continuous* LSH functions; where this restriction is in place, we have stated it explicitly.

Example 2.1. The following examples of LSH functions are well-known and easily verified.

(1) A convex function is subharmonic. On $\mathbb{R}$, f is subharmonic if and only if f is convex.
(2) Let f be a holomorphic function on $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then $|f|$ is a log–subharmonic function (see [16] or use Jensen's inequality). Indeed, $\log |f|$ is actually harmonic on the complement of $\{f = 0\}$.
(3) Denote by $\langle\ ,\ \rangle$ the scalar product on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and fix $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then $x \mapsto \exp\langle a, x\rangle$ is a log–subharmonic function.

The main content of the next proposition is item 2, which takes some work to prove and will be important in what follows.

Proposition 2.2. *Let f, g be* LSH, *and let $p > 0$.*

1. *The product fg is* LSH, *as is g^p.*
2. *The sum $f + g$ is* LSH.
3. *f is subharmonic.*

Proof. Property 1 is evident. In order to prove 3 (note that non-negativity is built into the definition of LSH functions), we use the fact that if a function $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is increasing and convex and h is a subharmonic function then $\varphi(h)$ is also subharmonic. We apply this fact with $\varphi(x) = e^x$ and $h = \log f$ when f is LSH. To prove 2, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function of two variables, increasing in each variable. If F and G are subharmonic functions then $\varphi(F, G)$ is also subharmonic.*

Proof. As the function φ is convex, the region $R = \{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 ; \varphi(x, y) \geq z\}$ is convex; accordingly R may be specified by a collection of tangent planes. That is, there is a set of affine functionals $A_k(x, y) = a_k x + b_k y + c_k$ (for some constants $a_k, b_k, c_k \in \mathbb{R}$) ranging over some (typically uncountable) index set $k \in K$, such that $(x, y, z) \in R$ if and only if $z \geq \sup_{k\in K} A_k(x, y)$. Hence, the function φ is determined by

$$\varphi(x, y) = \sup_{k\in K} A_k(x, y) = \sup_{k\in K}(a_k x + b_k y + c_k).$$

The function φ is increasing in each variable, so $a_k, b_k \geq 0$. Now, for $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$, denote

$$P_{x,r} f = \fint_{\partial B(x,r)} f(t)\, \sigma(dt),$$

following the alternative condition for subharmonicity in Remark 2.1. To prove the lemma, it therefore suffices to show that $P_{x,r}\varphi(F, G) \geq \varphi(F, G)(x)$ for each x. We have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{x,r}\varphi(F, G) &= P_{x,r} \sup_{k\in K} A_k(F, G) \geq \sup_{k\in K} P_{x,r}(a_k F + b_k G + c_k) \\ &\geq \sup_{k\in K}(a_k F(x) + b_k G(x) + c_k) = \varphi(F, G)(x). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the Lemma. □

It is easy to verify that the function $\varphi(x, y) = \log(e^x + e^y)$ satisfies the hypotheses of the lemma: to check its convexity, we write $\log(e^x + e^y) = x + \log(1 + e^{x-y})$, yielding the result since the function $t \mapsto \ln(1 + e^t)$ is convex. Hence, if f and g are LSH, then $f = e^F$ and $g = e^G$ for subharmonic functions F, G, and so the lemma yields that $\varphi(F, G) = \log(f + g)$ is subharmonic. This ends the proof of the proposition. □

The following two corollaries of Proposition 2.2 are useful in much of the following.

Corollary 2.4. *Let Ω be a separable metric space, and let μ a Borel probability measure on Ω. Suppose $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies*

1. *The function $x \mapsto f(\omega, x)$ is* LSH *and continuous for μ–almost every $\omega \in \Omega$.*
2. *The function $\omega \mapsto f(\omega, x)$ is bounded and continuous for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.*
3. *For small $r > 0$, there is a constant $C_r > 0$ so that, for all $\omega \in \Omega$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|f(\omega, t)| \leq C_r$ for $t \in B(x, r)$.*

Then the function $\tilde{f}(x) = \int_\Omega f(\omega, x)\, \mu(d\omega)$ is LSH.

Proof. By Varadarajan's theorem (see Theorem 11.4.1 in [4]), there is a sequence of points $\omega_j \in \Omega$ such that the probability measures

$$\mu_n = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \delta_{\omega_j}$$

converge weakly to μ: $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$. Note that

$$\tilde{f}_n(x) = \int_\Omega f(\omega, x)\mu_n(d\omega) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} f(\omega_j, x),$$

and by Proposition 2.2 part (2), $\tilde{f}_n$ is LSH for each n. Moreover, since $f(\,\cdot\,, x) \in C_b(\Omega)$, weak convergence guarantees that $\tilde{f}_n(x) \to \tilde{f}(x)$ for each x. Fix $\epsilon > 0$; then since $\tilde{f}_n$ and $\tilde{f}$ are non-negative, $\tilde{f}_n + \epsilon$ and $\tilde{f} + \epsilon$ are strictly positive and thus $\log(\tilde{f}_n(x) + \epsilon) \to \log(\tilde{f}(x) + \epsilon)$ for each x. Again using Proposition 2.2, $\tilde{f}_n + \epsilon$ is LSH and so $\log(\tilde{f}_n + \epsilon)$ is subharmonic. Let $r > 0$ be small, and consider

$$\fint_{\partial B(x,r)} \log(\tilde{f}(t) + \epsilon)\, dt = \fint_{\partial B(x,r)} \lim_{n\to\infty} \log(\tilde{f}_n(t) + \epsilon)\, dt.$$

By assumption, $|f(\omega, t)| \le C_r$ for each $\omega \in \Omega$ and $t \in \partial B(x, r)$; hence, $|\tilde{f}_n(t)| \le C_r$ a well. This means there is a uniform bound on $\log(\tilde{f}_n + \epsilon)$ on $\partial B(x, r)$. We may therefore apply the dominated convergence theorem to find that

$$\begin{aligned}\fint_{\partial B(x,r)} \log(\tilde{f}(t) + \epsilon)\, dt &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \fint_{\partial B(x,r)} \log(\tilde{f}_n(t) + \epsilon)\, dt \\ &\ge \lim_{n\to\infty} \log(\tilde{f}_n(x) + \epsilon) = \log(\tilde{f}(x) + \epsilon),\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from the fact that $\log(\tilde{f}_n + \epsilon)$ is subharmonic. Hence, $\tilde{f} + \epsilon$ is LSH for each $\epsilon > 0$. Finally, since $f(\omega, x)$ is continuous in x for almost every ω, the boundedness of f in ω shows that $\tilde{f}$ is continuous. Thus the set where $\tilde{f} > -\infty$ is open. Therefore $\log(\tilde{f}(x) + \epsilon)$ is uniformly-bounded in ϵ on small enough balls around x, and a simple argument like the one above shows that the limit as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ can be performed to show that $\tilde{f}$ is LSH as required. ☐

Remark 2.5. It is possible to dispense with the requirement that $f(\omega, x)$ is continuous in x by using Fatou's lemma instead of the dominated convergence theorem; however, the continuity of $f(\omega, x)$ in ω is still required for this argument. In all the applications we have planned for Corollary 2.4, $f(\omega, x)$ is such that continuity in one variable implies continuity in the other, and so we need not work harder to eliminate this hypothesis.

Remark 2.6. In Corollary 2.4, if LSH is replaced with the weaker condition *lower-bounded subharmonic* (in the premise and conclusion of the statement), then the result follows from Definition 2.1 with a simple application of Fubini's theorem; moreover, the only assumption needed is that $f(\,\cdot\,, x) \in L^1(\Omega, \mu)$ for each x.

Corollary 2.7. *Suppose $f\colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is lower-bounded and subharmonic. Then the function*

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \int_{O(n)} f(\alpha x)\, d\alpha$$

is subharmonic. Moreover, if f is also LSH *and continuous, then so is $\tilde{f}$. In either case, $\tilde{f}$ depends only on the radial direction: there is a function $g\colon [0, \infty) \to [-\infty, \infty)$ with $\tilde{f}(x) = g(|x|)$, and g is* non-decreasing *on $[0, \infty)$.*

Proof. Suppose f is LSH and continuous. The reader may readily verify that the function $(\alpha, x) \mapsto f(\alpha x)$ satisfies all the conditions of Corollary 2.4. (The weaker statement for lower-bounded subharmonic f, not necessarily continuous, follows similarly via Remark 2.6.) Clearly averaging f over rotations makes $\tilde{f}$ radially symmetric. Any radially symmetric subharmonic function is radially non-decreasing, by the maximum principle. ☐

3. HYPERCONTRACTIVITY INEQUALITIES FOR THE GAUSSIAN MEASURE

Let m be a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$. For $p \geq 1$, we denote the norm on $L^p(m)$ by $\| \quad \|_{p,m}$. We will denote by $L^p_{\mathrm{LSH}}(m)$ the cone of log-subharmonic functions in $L^p(m)$. Let γ be the standard Gaussian measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$, i.e. $\gamma(dx) = c_n \exp(-|x|^2/2)\, dx$, where dx is Lebesgue measure and $c_n = (2\pi)^{-n/2}$.

Given a function f on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $r \in [0,1]$, we denote by f_r the function $x \mapsto f(rx)$. The family of operators $S_r f = f_r, r \in [0,1]$ is a multiplicative semigroup, whose additive form $T_t f(x) = f(e^{-t}x)$ is considered in connection with holomorphic function spaces in [3, 10, 17, 24] and others (including the second author's paper [19] in the non-commutative holomorphic category). When f is differentiable, the infinitesimal generator E of $(T_t)_{t\geq 0}$ equals $-Ef$ where E is the Euler operator

$$Ef(x) = x \cdot \nabla f.$$

If N is the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck operator $N = -\Delta + E$ acting in $L^2(\mathbb{C}^n, \gamma)$ and f is a holomorphic function then $Nf = Ef$, so $(T_t)_{t\geq 0}$ and, equivalently, $(S_r)_{r\in[0,1]}$ act on holomorphic functions as the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck semigroup e^{-tN} (cf. [1] p.22–23).

Before showing the strong hypercontractivity of the semigroup S_r for the Gaussian measure and LSH functions, let us show that the operators S_r are L^p–contractions on non-negative subharmonic functions, for any rotationally invariant probability measure.

Proposition 3.1. *Let m be a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ which is $O(n)$-invariant. Then for $f \geq 0$ subharmonic , $r \in [0,1]$, and $p \geq 1$, we have*

$$\|f_r\|_{p,m} \leq \|f\|_{p,m}.$$

Moreover, this contraction property holds additionally in the regime $0 < p < 1$ of f is LSH.

Proof. First consider the case $p \geq 1$, and assume only that $f \geq 0$ is subharmonic. Note that, since $f \geq 0$ and since m is $O(n)$-invariant,

$$\|f_r\|^p_{p,m} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(rx)^p\, dm(x) = \int_{O(n)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(rx)^p\, dm(\alpha x)\, d\alpha.$$

Changing variables using the linear transformation α in the inside integral and using Fubini's theorem, we have (replacing α^{-1} with α in the end)

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{O(n)} f(r\alpha x)^p\, d\alpha\, dm(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} S_r\, h(x)\, dm(x),$$

where $h(x) = \int_{O(n)} f(\alpha x)^p\, d\alpha$; i.e., with $k = f^p$, $h = \tilde{k}$ in the notation of Corollary 2.7. Since $p \geq 1$, k is subharmonic, and so by Corollary 2.7 h is also subharmonic and radially increasing. In particular, there is some non-decreasing $g\colon [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $h(x) = g(|x|)$. So $S_r\, h(x) = g(r|x|) \leq g(|x|) = h(x)$ for $r \in [0,1]$. Integrating over $\mathbb{R}^n$ we have $\|f_r\|^p_{p,m} \leq \int h(x)\, dx$ which equals $\|f\|^p_{p,m}$ by reversing the above argument. This proves the result.

If $0 < p < 1$, the above argument follows through as well since, if $f \in \mathrm{LSH}$ then $k = f^p$ is LSH by Proposition 2.2. In particular, k is non-negative and subharmonic, and so by Corollary 2.7, so is $\tilde{k}$. The rest of the proof follows verbatim.

□

We now show the strong hypercontractivity inequality for Gaussian measure and LSH functions. That is: $\|T_t f\|_{q,\gamma} \leq \|f\|_{p,\gamma}$ whenever f is LSH and $t \geq t_J(p,q)$. This is a generalization (from holomorphic functions to the much larger class of logarithmically-subharmonic functions) of Janson's original strong hypercontractivity theorem in [17]. Because our test functions f are non-negative and the action of T_t commutes with taking powers of f, this can be reduced to the following simplified form.

Theorem 3.2. *Let f be a log–subharmonic function. Then for every $r \in [0,1]$, one has*

$$\|f_r\|_{1/r^2,\gamma} \leq \|f\|_{1,\gamma}. \tag{3.1}$$

Remark 3.3. The inequality (3.1) means that the operators S_r act as contractions between the spaces

$$S_r : L^1_{\mathrm{LSH}}(\gamma) \to L^{1/r^2}_{\mathrm{LSH}}(\gamma),$$

or, equivalently, the operator T_t is a contraction between the cones

$$T_t : L^1_{\mathrm{LSH}}(\gamma) \to L^{e^{2t}}_{\mathrm{LSH}}(\gamma).$$

In fact, by Proposition 2.2, one gets other hypercontractivity properties. Applying the theorem to the function f^p, it follows that the operators S_r are contractions

$$S_r : L^p_{\mathrm{LSH}}(\gamma) \to L^{p/r^2}_{\mathrm{LSH}}(\gamma),$$

and the operators T_t are contractions

$$T_t : L^p_{\mathrm{LSH}}(\gamma) \to L^{e^{2t}p}_{\mathrm{LSH}}(\gamma)$$

for any $p > 0$. Since T_t is an L^q contraction for any q (Proposition 3.1), by the semigroup property the above implies that T_t is a contraction from L^p to L^q for any $q \geq e^{2t}p$. In other words, T_t is a contraction from L^p to L^q provided that $t \geq \frac{1}{2}\log(q/p)$, the Janson time $t_J(p,q)$. This is the strong hypercontractivity theorem proved in [17] for holomorphic functions on $\mathbb{C}^n \cong \mathbb{R}^{2n}$; here we prove it for LSH functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof. The case where $f = \log|g|$ with g holomorphic on $\mathbb{C}^n$ is implicitly proved in [17] but is not given in this form. Using the ideas of Janson, we will prove the general theorem. Nelson's classical hypercontractivity result plays a crucial role here as in Janson's paper. Let $P_t = e^{-tN}$ be the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck semigroup. Let us write it in the form

$$P_t f(x) = \int M_r(x,y) f(y)\, \gamma(dy) \tag{3.2}$$

where $r = e^{-t}$ and M_r is the *Mehler kernel*

$$M_r(x,y) = (1-r^2)^{-n/2} \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{1-r^2}|x|^2 + \frac{2r}{1-r^2}\langle x,y\rangle - \frac{1+r^2}{1-r^2}|y|^2\right). \tag{3.3}$$

We can rewrite Equation 3.2 in terms of Lebesgue measure as $P_t f(x) = \int K_r(x,y) f(y)\, dy$ where the modified kernel K_r is given by

$$K_r(x,y) = (1-r^2)^{-n/2} \exp\left(-\frac{|y-rx|^2}{1-r^2}\right).$$

Evidently $K_r(x,y)$ is constant in y on spheres around rx. This implies that if $f \geq 0$ is subharmonic, then for all $t > 0$ we have $P_t f(x) \geq f(e^{-t}x)$ (indeed, this is at the core of Janson's proof in [17]). The classical hypercontractivity inequality of Nelson (cf. [21]) is given by:

$$\|P_t f\|_{q(t),\gamma} \leq \|f\|_{p,\gamma}$$

where $q(t) = (p-1)e^{2t} + 1$ and $p > 1$. Hence, for $f \geq 0$ subharmonic, we have Nelson's theorem for the dilation semigroup:

$$\|f(e^{-t}x)\|_{q(t),\gamma} \leq \|f\|_{p,\gamma}. \tag{3.4}$$

Now take f to be LSH. The function $f^{1/p}$ is also LSH, so it is positive and subharmonic. Equation 3.4 applied to $f^{1/p}$ becomes

$$\left(\int f_{e^{-t}}(x)^{q(t)/p} d\gamma(x)\right)^{1/q(t)} \leq \left(\int f(x) d\gamma(x))\right)^{1/p}.$$

This implies that

$$\|f_{e^{-t}}\|_{q(t)/p,\gamma} \leq \|f\|_{1,\gamma}.$$

Observe that $\lim_{p\to\infty} \frac{q(t)}{p} = e^{2t} = \frac{1}{r^2}$ where $r = e^{-t}$. Applying Fatou's lemma, we obtain $\|f_r\|_{r^{-2},\gamma} \leq \|f\|_{1,\gamma}$, the desired result. $\square$

In the full hypercontractivity theory due to Nelson [21], $t_N(p,q) = \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{q-1}{p-1}$ is the smallest time to contraction, for all L^p-functions. The analogous statement holds for Theorem 3.2; the exponent $1/r^2$ is optimal in this inequality (with Gaussian measure) over all LSH functions. In fact, it is optimal when restricted just to holomorphic functions on $\mathbb{C}^n$, as is proved (in an analogous non-commutative setting) in [19]; here we present a slightly different proof.

Proposition 3.4. *Let* $r \in (0,1]$ *and* $C > 0$. *Assume that for some* $p > 0$, *the following inequality holds for every* LSH *function* f*:*

$$\|f_r\|_{p,\gamma} \le C\|f\|_{1,\gamma}. \tag{3.5}$$

Then $p \le 1/r^2$ *and* $C \ge 1$.

Remark 3.5. If m is a probability measure then the L^p norm $\|f\|_{p,m}$ is a non-decreasing function of p. It follows that if Equation (3.5) holds for a $p > 1$ then it also holds for every $q \in [1,p)$.

Proof. Consider the set of functions $f^a(x) = e^{ax_1}$, which are all LSH for $a > 0$. An easy computation shows that $\|(f^a)_r\|_{p,\gamma} = \exp(r^2a^2p/2)$; in particular, $\|(f^a)\|_{1,\gamma} = \exp(a^2/2)$. The supposed inequality (3.5) then implies that $\exp(r^2a^2p/2) \le C\exp(a^2/2)$ for all $a > 0$. Set $s = r^2p$. Then $\exp(a^2(s-1)/2) \le C$ for every real a. Letting $a \to 0$ shows that $C \ge 1$; letting $a \to \infty$ shows that $s \le 1$. □

Remark 3.6. Hypercontractive inequalities very typically involve actual contractions (i.e. constant $C = 1$ in Proposition 3.4), since the time constant (t_N or t_J in this case) are usually independent of dimension, yielding an infinite-dimensional version of the inequality. Indeed, in Nelson's original work [21], one main technique was to show that hypercontractivity held in all dimensions up to a fixed (dimension-independent) constant $C > 1$. The infinite-dimensional version then implies that $C = 1$ is the best inequality, for if the best constant is > 1 or < 1, a tensor argument shows that in infinite dimensions the constant is ∞ or 0, respectively.

In the following, we will proceed along the lines of Remark 3.6 and give a different proof of Theorem 3.2, with a non-optimal constant, that avoids direct use of Nelson's result, but produces a dimension-*dependent* constant. First we need the following L^∞ inequality.

Lemma 3.7. *Let* f *be an* LSH *function. Then for all* $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\exp(-\|x\|^2/2)f(x) \le \|f\|_{1,\gamma}.$$

Remark 3.8. This inequality is sharp: take $f \equiv 1$.

Proof. From the proof of Proposition 3.1 with $r = 0$ and $m = \gamma$, it follows that for every non-negative subharmonic function g, the inequality $g(0) \le \int g(x)\,d\gamma(x)$ holds. Now take an LSH function f and $a, x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. It is easy to check that the translated function $y \mapsto f(x+y)$ is also LSH. Then the function f_x given by

$$f_x(y) = f(x+y)e^{\langle a,y\rangle}$$

is a product of two LSH functions, and so is LSH by Proposition 2.2. In particular, it is non-negative and subharmonic. Applying the last inequality to f_x, we get

$$f(x) = f_x(0) \le \int f(x+y)e^{\langle a,y\rangle}\,d\gamma(y). \tag{3.6}$$

Make the change of variables $v = x + y$. Then the right-hand-side of Equation 3.6 becomes

$$\int f(v)e^{\langle a,v-x\rangle}e^{-|v-x|^2/2}\,(2\pi)^{-n/2}\,dv$$

and is equal to

$$e^{-\langle a,x\rangle}e^{-\|x\|^2/2}\int f(v)e^{-\|v\|^2/2}e^{\langle a,v\rangle}e^{\langle x,v\rangle}\,(2\pi)^{-n/2}\,dv.$$

The conclusion follows by taking $a = -x$. □

Proposition 3.9. *(Hyperboundedness) For the constant* $C = e^{1/2e} > 1$*, and for every* $r \in [0,1]$*, the following inequality is true for any* LSH *function* f *on* $\mathbb{R}^n$*:*

$$\|f_r\|_{1/r^2,\gamma} \le C^n \, \|f\|_{1,\gamma}.$$

Proof. Denote $I_r = \left(\|f_r\|_{1/r^2,\gamma}\right)^{1/r^2} = \int f(rx)^{1/r^2}\, d\gamma(x)$. By the change of variables $y = rx$, the integral I_r can be written as

$$\frac{(2\pi)^{-n/2}}{r^n} \int a(y)^{1/r^2}\, dy,$$

where $a(y) = f(y)\exp(-|y|^2/2)$. By Lemma 3.7, $a(y) \le I_1$, which implies that $a(y)^{1/r^2-1} \le I_1^{1/r^2-1}$. Now write $a(y)^{1/r^2} = a(y)a(y)^{1/r^2-1}$. Then

$$I_r = \frac{(2\pi)^{-n/2}}{r^n} \int a(y)a(y)^{1/r^2-1} dy \le r^{-n}\left(\int a(y)(2\pi)^{-n/2}\, dy\right) I_1^{1/r^2-1} = r^{-n} I_1^{1/r^2-1} I_1 = r^{-n} I_1^{1/r^2}.$$

Consequently, $(I_r)^{r^2} \le \left(r^{-nr^2}\right) I_1$. This can be read as: $\|f_r\|_{1/r^2,\gamma} \le r^{-nr^2} \|f\|_{1,\gamma}$. The function $r \mapsto (\frac{1}{r})^{r^2}$ is maximized on $(0,1]$ by $C = e^{\frac{1}{2e}} \approx 1.445$. This completes the proof. ☐

4. HYPERCONTRACTIVITY INEQUALITIES FOR PROBABILITY MEASURES

In this section we study hypercontractivity properties of LSH functions with respect to any probability measure m. We have already seen in Proposition 3.1 that, for rotationally invariant measures m, the semigroup S_r is always an L^p contraction.

Theorem 4.1. *Fix* $q > 1$ *and* $r \in (0,1]$*. Suppose that* μ_1 *and* μ_2 *are two probability measures on* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *which verify the hypercontractivity inequality*

$$\|f_r\|_{q,\mu} \le \|f\|_{1,\mu} \tag{4.1}$$

for any continuous LSH *function* f*. It at least one of* μ_1 *and* μ_2 *is compactly-supported, then the convolved measure* $\mu_1 * \mu_2$ *also satisfies (4.1).*

Proof. Let f be a continuous LSH function, and suppose μ_1 is compactly-supported. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int f(rz)^q d(\mu_1 * \mu_2)(z) &= \int\int f(rx+ry)^q \, d\mu_1(x)\, d\mu_2(y) \\ &\le \int \left(\int f(x+ry)\, d\mu_1(x)\right)^q d\mu_2(y) \end{aligned}$$

since the function $x \mapsto f(x+ry)$ is continuous LSH for each fixed $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and μ_1 satisfies (4.1). Let $h(y) = \int f(x+y)\, d\mu_1(x)$, so that we have proven that

$$\|f_r\|^q_{q,\mu_1*\mu_2} \le \int h(ry)^q \, d\mu_2(y) = \|h_r\|^q_{1,\mu_2}. \tag{4.2}$$

Since f is continuous, the function $(x,y) \mapsto f(x+y)$ is continuous in both variables, and also LSH in each. Since $\operatorname{supp}\mu_1$ is compact and f is continuous, all the conditions of Corollary 2.4 are satisfied, and so h is LSH. Thence, by the assumption of the theorem, the quantity on the right-hand-side of Equation 4.2 is bounded above by $\|h\|^q_{1,\mu_2}$. By definition,

$$\|h\|_{1,\mu_2} = \int h(y)\, d\mu_2(y) = \int\int f(x+y)\, d\mu_1(x)\, d\mu_2(y) = \|f\|_{1,\mu_1*\mu_2},$$

and this proves that Inequality 4.1 also holds for $\mu_1 * \mu_2$. ☐

Most of the following results of this section concern the 1–dimensional case, i.e. log–convex functions on the real line. In that case, one has the following surprisingly general hypercontractivity inequality.

Proposition 4.2. *For every symmetric probability measure m on $\mathbb{R}$, and for any logarithmically convex function f on $\mathbb{R}$, the following inequality is true for any $r \in (0,1]$:*

$$\|f_r\|_{1/r,m} \leq \|f\|_{1,m}.$$

Remark 4.3. Translating this statement into additive language, the dilation semigroup T_t satisfies strong hypercontractivity with time to contraction at most $2 \cdot t_J$, for any symmetric probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$, for log–convex functions. As explained above, a simple scaling $f \mapsto f^p$ yields the comparable result from $L^p \to L^q$ for $q \geq p > 0$.

Proof. By the log–convexity of f, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$f(rx) \leq f(0)^{1-r} f(x)^r,$$

which implies that $f(rx)^{1/r} \leq f(0)^{1/r-1} f(x)$. Then by m-integration,

$$\int f(rx)^{1/r} dm(x) \leq f(0)^{1/r-1} ||f||_{1,m}.$$

Since f is convex, $f(0) \leq \frac{1}{2}[f(x)+f(-x)]$ for all x. Integrating and using the symmetry of m yields $f(0) \leq ||f||_{1,m}$. Consequently,

$$\int f(rx)^{1/r} dm(x) \leq ||f||_{1,m}^{1/r},$$

and the Proposition follows. ☐

Remark 4.4. Proposition 4.2 remains true for rotationally invariant measures m and log–convex functions f on $\mathbb{R}^n$. This proof fails, however, for general LSH functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$ when $n \geq 2$.

Remark 4.5. Subject to additional regularity on m, the symmetry condition in Proposition 4.2 can be replaced with the much weaker assumption that m is centred: i.e. m has a finite first moment, and $\int x\, m(dx) = 0$. In short, fix a log-convex f, and suppose that m is regular enough that the function $\eta(r) = \int f(rx)\, m(dx)$ is differentiable, so that $\eta'(r) = \int f'(rx) x\, m(dx)$. (It is easy to see, from convexity of f, that $f_r \in L^1(m)$ for each r, provided $f \in L^1(m)$.) Then $\eta'(0) = f'(0) \int x\, m(dx) = 0$, and since f is convex, f' is increasing which means that $xf'(rx) \geq xf'(x)$ for all x, $r \geq 0$, so $\eta'(r) \geq \eta'(0) = 0$. Thus, $\int f\, dm = \eta(1) \geq \eta(0) = f(0)$, and the rest of the above proof follows. For this to work, it is necessary to assume (at minimum) that the functions $\frac{\partial}{\partial r} f(rx) = f'(rx)x$ are uniformly bounded in $L^1(m)$; a convenient way to achieve this is to assume that functions $g \in L^1(m)$ for which $x \mapsto xg'(x)$ is also in $L^1(m)$ are dense in $L^1(m)$. The kinds of measures for which such a Sobolev-space density is known is a main topic of our subsequent paper [20].

The problem in general is to find, for a fixed measure m, the maximal exponent q such that $\|f_r\|_{q,m} \leq \|f\|_{1,m}$ for every $r \in (0,1]$ and any log-convex function f on $\mathbb{R}$. For symmetric Bernoulli measures we will show that the optimal exponent q is the same as for Gaussian measures.

Proposition 4.6. *If $m = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_1 + \delta_{-1})$ then*

$$\|f_r\|_{1/r^2,m} \leq \|f\|_{1,m} \tag{4.3}$$

for every $r \in (0,1]$ and any log-convex function f.

Remark 4.7. It follows from Proposition 4.6, and a simple rescaling argument, that the same strong hypercontractivity inequality holds for any symmetric Bernoulli measure $\frac{1}{2}(\delta_a + \delta_{-a})$, $a > 0$.

Proof. Step 1. We justify that it is sufficient to prove the proposition for the two-parameter family of functions $h(x) = C\exp(ax)$ with $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $C > 0$. Take f strictly positive. Then there exists h of the form $C\exp(ax)$ such that the functions f and h are equal on the set $\{-1, +1\}$. Assume now that f is log-convex. Then $f \leq h$ on $[-1,1]$, and in particular $f(r) \leq h(r)$ and $f(-r) \leq h(-r)$. This implies that

$$\int f(rx)^{1/r^2}\, dm(x) \leq \int h(rx)^{1/r^2}\, dm(x).$$

If the function h satisfies (4.3), we obtain

$$\|f_r\|_{q,m} \leq \|h_r\|_{q,m} \leq \|h\|_{1,m} = \|f\|_{1,m},$$

the last equality following from the fact that f and h coincide on the support of m. This gives the inequality (4.3) for f.

Step 2: We show the inequality (4.3) for $f(x) = e^{ax}$ (the constant C obviously factors out of the desired inequality). This is essentially an exercise. One has to prove that

$$\left(\int \exp(ax/r) dm(x) \right)^{r^2} \leq \int \exp(ax) dm(x),$$

i.e. $\left(\cosh(\frac{a}{r})\right)^{r^2} \leq \cosh a$ for a real and $r \in (0, 1]$. Put $s = 1/r$. Then $s \geq 1$ and the required inequality becomes $\cosh(sa) \leq (\cosh a)^{s^2}$. Taking logarithms and next dividing by s^2a^2, we are left to prove that

$$\frac{\log(\cosh(sa))}{s^2a^2} \leq \frac{\log(\cosh a)}{a^2}.$$

In other words, we must prove that the function $\log(\cosh x)/x^2$ is decreasing for $x \geq 0$. Taking the derivative, it is sufficient to see that $\rho(x) = x \tanh x - 2 \log(\cosh x)$ is nonpositive for $x \geq 0$. Well, $\rho(0) = 0$, and $\rho'(x) = x/\cosh^2 x - \tanh x = \frac{x - \sinh x \cosh x}{\cosh^2 x}$. This last quotient is non-positive for its numerator is equal to $x - (\sinh 2x)/2$. ☐

Remark 4.8. Proposition 4.3 could be obtained from an inequality of A. Bonami [2] similarly to the manner in which Theorem 3.2 was obtained from Nelson's hypercontractivity theorem for Gaussian measures. She proved that for symmetric Bernoulli measures the same classical hypercontractivity inequalities as for the Gaussian measure hold. In order to prove Proposition 4.3 for a log-convex function f, one compares it to the affine function which takes the same value as f on $\{-1, 1\}$. For a function on $\{-1, 1\}$, there is a unique affine function on the line which extends it. Thus one can identify the space $C\{-1, 1\}$ of functions on $\{-1, 1\}$ and the space of affine functions on the line. We omit the details.

Corollary 4.9. *The symmetric uniform probability measure λ_a on $[-a, a]$, $a > 0$, satisfies the strong hypercontractivity property $\|f_r\|_{1/r^2, \lambda_a} \leq \|f\|_{1, \lambda_a}$ for all* LSH *functions.*

Proof. Let $m_x = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_x + \delta_{-x})$. It is easy to see that

$$\mu_k := m_{\frac{1}{2}} * m_{\frac{1}{4}} * \ldots * m_{\frac{1}{2^k}} \rightharpoonup \lambda_1, \quad k \to \infty,$$

where we denote by $\rightharpoonup$ the convergence in law. By the Proposition 4.6 (and the proceeding Remark 4.7) and Theorem 4.1, the inequality (4.3) holds for the measures μ_k. The supports of the measures μ_k and λ_1 are compact and included in the segment $[-1, 1]$. If f is log–convex on $\mathbb{R}$, it is continuous and the convergence $\int_{-1}^{1} f \, d\mu_k \to \int_{-1}^{1} f \, d\lambda_1$ follows from the convergence in law $\mu_k \Rightarrow \lambda_1$. The statement for all $a > 0$ now follows from a simple rescaling argument. ☐

5. LOGARITHMIC SOBOLEV INEQUALITIES FOR LSH FUNCTIONS ON $\mathbb{R}$

In this section we will prove that a strong log–Sobolev inequality holds for log-subharmonic functions and Gaussian measures in 1 dimension. We will also show log-Sobolev Inequalities for other 1–dimensional measures from previous sections, for which we showed the strong hypercontractivity for LSH functions (symmetric Bernoulli measures, uniform symmetric measures or any symmetric probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$.) Considerably more general log-Sobolev inequalities (in all dimensions) hold in the LSH category; this will be discussed in [20].

Recall that the classical Gaussian Logarithmic Sobolev Inequality, cf. [1, 9], is

$$\mathcal{E}(f^2) = \int |f|^2 \log |f|^2 d\gamma - \|f\|_{2,\gamma}^2 \log \|f\|_{2,\gamma}^2 \leq 2 \int f L f d\gamma \tag{5.1}$$

where γ is the standard Gaussian measure, $L = -\Delta + E$ is the generator of the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck semigroup and $f \in \mathcal{A}$, a standard algebra contained in the domain of the operator L. For the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck semigroup $\mathcal{A}$ can be chosen as the space of $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ functions with slowly increasing derivatives. The expression $\mathcal{E}(f)$ is often called the entropy of f.

The celebrated theorem of Gross [9] establishes the equivalence between the hypercontractivity property of a semigroup T_t with invariant measure μ and the log–Sobolev inequality relative to the generator L of T_t. More precisely, recalling the Nelson time $t_N = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{q-1}{p-1}$, the hypercontractivity inequalities $\|T_t f\|_{q,\mu} \leq \|f\|_{p,\mu}$ for $t \geq c\, t_N(p,q)$ for $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ are, together, equivalent to the single log–Sobolev Inequality

$$\mathcal{E}(f^2) = \int |f|^2 \log |f|^2 d\mu - \|f\|_{2,\mu}^2 \log \|f\|_{2,\mu}^2 \leq 2c \int f L f \, d\mu. \tag{5.2}$$

In the Gaussian case these inequalities indeed hold with $c = 1$.

Now, let f be a positive subharmonic function of class $\mathcal{C}^2$. Then $\Delta f \geq 0$ and $Lf \leq Ef$. From (5.1) it follows that

$$\mathcal{E}(f^2) = \int |f|^2 \log |f|^2 \, d\gamma - \|f\|_{2,\gamma}^2 \log \|f\|_{2,\gamma}^2 \leq 2 \int f E f \, d\gamma. \tag{5.3}$$

If, moreover, f is LSH, we set $g = f^2$ and using the fact that $Eg = 2fEf$ we can write the last inequality as

$$\mathcal{E}(g) = \int g \log g \, d\gamma - \|g\|_{1,\gamma} \log \|g\|_{1,\gamma} \leq \int Eg \, d\gamma. \tag{5.4}$$

In this section we will prove that a **stronger** Log-Sobolev Inequality

$$\mathcal{E}(g) \leq \frac{1}{2} \int Eg \, d\gamma \tag{5.5}$$

holds for log–subharmonic functions g and Gaussian measure γ in 1 dimension, as well as with γ replaced by a symmetric Bernoulli measure or symmetric uniform measure on $\mathbb{R}$. Indeed, the constant factor 1 from the inequality (5.4) is optimal in general; here we prove that in the LSH category, the constant is instead $\frac{1}{2}$ (as in 5.5).

It may seem surprising that the integrals $\int fEf \, d\gamma$ from (5.3) and, equivalently, $\int Eg \, d\gamma$ from (5.4) are positive when f and g are LSH functions. The following proposition explains this phenomenon, which holds more generally for subharmonic functions.

Proposition 5.1. *Let m be a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ which is $O(n)$ invariant, and let and $g \in \mathcal{C}^1$ be a subhamronic function. Then*

$$I = \int Eg(x) dm(x) \geq 0.$$

Proof. We have

$$I = \int dm(x) \int_{O(n)} Eg(\alpha x) \, d\alpha,$$

where $d\alpha$ denotes the Haar measure on $O(n)$. Denote by σ the normalized Lebegue measure on the unit sphere S^{n-1}. If $r = \|x\|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{O(n)} Eg(\alpha x) \, d\alpha = \int_{S^{n-1}} (Eg)(ru) \, \sigma(du) &= r \int_{S^{n-1}} \frac{\partial g}{\partial r}(ru) \, \sigma(du) \\ &= r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \int_{S^{n-1}} g(ru) \, \sigma(du) \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

because the function $r \mapsto \int_{S^{n-1}} g(ru) \, \sigma(du)$ is increasing (cf. Corollary 2.7). $\square$

5.1. **Log-Sobolev Inequalities for measures with compact support.** The following techniques work, in principle, quite generally. However, the usual approximation techniques to guarantee integrability (convolution approximations and cut-offs) are unavailable in the category of subharmonic functions. As such, we include this section which develops the relevant log-Sobolev inequalities in all dimensions, but only for compactly–supported measures (i.e. do the cut-off in the measure rather than the test functions). Extension of these results to a much larger class of measures is the topic of [20].

Theorem 5.2. *Let μ be a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with* **compact support***. Suppose that for some $c > 0$, the following strong hypercontractivity property holds: for $0 < p \le q < \infty$ and $f \in L^p_{\mathrm{LSH}}(\mu)$,*

$$\|f_{e^{-t}}\|_{q,\mu} \le \|f\|_{p,\mu} \quad \text{for } t \ge c \cdot \tfrac{1}{2}\log\tfrac{q}{p}.$$

Then for any log–subharmonic function $f \in \mathcal{C}^1$ the following logarithmic Sobolev inequality holds:

$$\int f^2 \log f^2 d\mu - \|f\|^2_{2,\mu} \log \|f\|^2_{2,\mu} \le c \int f E f \, d\mu. \tag{5.6}$$

Remark 5.3. (1) The condition $f \in \mathcal{C}^1$ is natural to ensure a good sense of the expression Ef in (5.6). In the classical case in [1] one supposes $f \in \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C}^\infty$ and such an LSI inequality is equivalent to the hypercontractivity property ([1], Theorem 2.8.2).

(2) In the case of strong hypercontractivity with optimal $q = p/r^2$ (symmetric Bernoulli measures and their convolutions, symmetric uniform measures on $[-a, a]$), the constant c is equal to 1. Also Gaussian measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$ have the constant $c = 1$ but evidently they are not covered by the Theorem 5.2. When $q = p/r$ (any symmetric measure on $\mathbb{R}$), the constant c is equal to 2. The time $t_J = \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{q}{p}$ appearing in Theorem 5.2 is Janson's time.

(3) Theorem 5.2 is stated and proved here for compactly-supported measures, a class not including the most important Gaussian measures. In the next section we prove it *does* hold for Gaussian measure 1 dimension, see Theorems 5.7 and 5.8). In fact the same strong log-Sobolev inequality holds for Gaussian measures (and beyond) in all dimensions; this will be covered in [20]. Let us reiterate that the following proof applies to a much wider class of measures, but the precise regularity conditions are complicated by the fact that cut-off approximations do not preserve the cone of log–subharmonic functions.

Proof. Let $p = 2$ and t be the critical time $t = c \cdot \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{q}{p}$. Then the variable $r = e^{-t}$ satisfies $q(r) = 2r^{-2/c}$. The method of proof is classical and consists of differentiating the function

$$\alpha(r) = \|f_r\|_{q(r),\mu}$$

at $r = 1$. By strong hypercontractivity, $\alpha(r) \le \alpha(1)$, so $\alpha'(1) \ge 0$ if we prove the existence of this derivative.

Define $\beta(r) = \alpha(r)^{q(r)} = \int f(rx)^{q(r)} d\mu(x)$ and let $\beta_x(r) = f(rx)^{q(r)}$, so that $\beta(r) = \int \beta_x(r) d\mu(x)$. Then

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \log \beta_x(r) = q'(r) \log f(rx) + \frac{q(r)}{f(rx)} x \cdot \nabla f(rx).$$

Since $q'(r) = -\frac{2}{rc} q(r)$, we compute

$$\beta'_x(r) = -\frac{2}{rc} f_r(x)^{q(r)} \log f_r(x)^{q(r)} + \frac{q(r)}{r} f_r(x)^{q(r)-1} (Ef)_r(x). \tag{5.7}$$

Let $0 < \epsilon < 1$. As $f \in \mathcal{C}^1$, the expression on the right-hand side of (5.7) is bounded for $r \in (1-\epsilon, 1]$ and $x \in \mathrm{supp}(\mu)$ (which is compact). The Dominated Convergence Theorem then implies that

$$\beta'(r) = \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \int \beta_x(r) \, d\mu(x) = \int \beta'_x(r) d\mu(x). \tag{5.8}$$

Finally, since $\alpha(r) = \beta(r)^{1/q(r)}$ and $\beta > 0$, we have that α is $\mathcal{C}^1$ on $(1-\epsilon, 1]$ and a simple calculation shows that

$$\alpha'(r) = \frac{\alpha(r)}{q(r)\beta(r)} \left[\frac{2}{rc} \beta(r) \log \beta(r) + \beta'(r) \right].$$

Now, taking $r = 1$, applying $\alpha'(1) \geq 0$ and the formulas (5.7) and (5.8) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \frac{2}{c}\beta(1)\log\beta(1) + \beta'(1) \\ &= \frac{2}{c}\|f\|^2_{2,\mu}\log\|f\|^2_{2,\mu} - \frac{2}{c}\int f^2\log f^2 d\mu + 2\int fEf d\mu, \end{aligned}$$

and this is the logarithmic Sobolev inequality (5.6). ☐

For $p > 0$ we define spaces $L^p_E(\mu) = \{f\,;\, f \in L^p(\mu) \text{ and } Ef \in L^p(\mu)\}$ and $L^p(\mu)\log L^p(\mu) = \{f\,;\, \int f^p|\log f^p|d\mu < \infty\}$. The former is a Sobolev space, the latter an Orlicz space, related to the logarithmic Sobolev inequality 5.6; indeed, in the case $p = 2$, they are the spaces for which the right– and left–hand sides (respectively) of that inequality are finite.

Appealing to the surprising Proposition 4.2, and Theorem 5.2, we have the following.

Corollary 5.4. *Let μ be a symmetric probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$. Then for any log-subharmonic function $f \in L^2(\mu)\log L^2(\mu) \cap L^2_E(\mu) \cap \mathcal{C}^1$ the following logarithmic Sobolev inequality holds:*

$$\int f^2\log f^2 d\mu - \|f\|^2_{L^2(\mu)}\log\|f\|^2_{L^2(\mu)} \leq 2\int fEf d\mu.$$

Remark 5.5. In the classical case it is sufficient to suppose only $f \in L^2_E(\mu)$; this actually implies that $f \in L^2(\mu)\log L^2(\mu)$. The proof of this fact involves approximation by more regular (e.g. compactly supported or bounded) functions, and these tools are unavailable to us here.

Proof. By Proposition 4.2 the measure μ as well as the measures $\mu_N = \mu|_{[-N,N]} + \mu([-N,N]^c)\delta_0$ verify the strong hypercontractivity property for LSH functions with $q = p/r$ and $c = 2$. Let f verify the hypothesis of the corollary, and set $f^\epsilon = f + \epsilon$; it is easy to check that f^ϵ also verifies all the conditions of the corollary. By Theorem 5.2, for each N

$$\int (f^\epsilon)^2\log(f^\epsilon)^2 d\mu_N - \|f^\epsilon\|^2_{2,\mu_N}\log\|f^\epsilon\|^2_{2,\mu_N} \leq 2\int f^\epsilon Ef^\epsilon d\mu_N.$$

When $N \to \infty$, $\mu_N \rightharpoonup \mu$ (weak convergence), and since $f^\epsilon \in \mathcal{C}^1$ and is strictly positive, all the functions $(f^\epsilon)^2$, $(f^\epsilon)^2\log(f^\epsilon)^2$, and $f^\epsilon Ef^\epsilon$ are continuous; hence the integrals in the last formula converge to analogous integrals in terms of f^ϵ with respect to the measure μ. Finally, we can let $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ to achieve the result, by the Monotone Convergence Theorem. ☐

EDITED UP TO HERE

Corollary 5.6. *Let μ be a symmetric probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$. Then for any log–subharmonic function $f \in L^1(\mu)\log L^1(\mu) \cap L^1_E(\mu) \cap \mathcal{C}^1$ the following logarithmic Sobolev inequality holds:*

$$\int f\log f d\mu - \|f\|_{1,\mu}\log\|f\|_{1,\mu} \leq \int Ef d\mu.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of the Corollary 5.4. Note, nevertheless, that Corollary 5.6 does not follow from Corollary 5.4 because the hypothesis $Ef \in L^1(\mu)$ is weaker than the condition $Ef \in L^2(\mu)$ supposed in Corollary 5.4 (all other integrability hypotheses are equivalent by the transformation $f \mapsto f^2$ which maps L^2 onto L^1). ☐

5.2. **Log-Sobolev Inequality for Gaussian measures on $\mathbb{R}$.**

We formulate two versions of the Logarithmic Sobolev Ineaquality for log-subharmonic functions: in the classical context $L^2(\gamma)$ (Theorem 5.7) and in the more natural and technically simpler case $L^1(\gamma)$.

Both cases are nearly equivalent since $f \in L^2(\gamma)$ and log–subharmonic is equivalent to $f^2 \in L^1(\gamma)$ and log–subharmonic. But the integration hypotheses of the theorems are slightly different, cf. the discussion in the proof of the Corollary 5.6.

Theorem 5.7. *Let γ be the Gaussian measure with density $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-x^2/2}$ on $\mathbb{R}$. Then for any* LSH *and* $\mathcal{C}^1$ *function $f \in L^2(\gamma)\log L^2(\gamma) \cap L^2_E(\gamma)$ the following logarithmic Sobolev inequality holds*

$$\int f^2 \log f^2 d\gamma - \|f\|^2_{2,\gamma} \log \|f\|^2_{2,\gamma} \leq \int f E f d\gamma. \tag{5.9}$$

Theorem 5.8. *Let γ be as in Theorem 5.7. Then for any* LSH *and* $\mathcal{C}^1$ *function $f \in L^1(\gamma)\log L^1(\gamma) \cap L^1_E(\gamma)$ the following logarithmic Sobolev inequality holds*

$$\int f \log f d\gamma - \|f\|_{1,\gamma} \log \|f\|_{1,\gamma} \leq \frac{1}{2}\int E f d\gamma. \tag{5.10}$$

Note that the method of the proof of Corollary 5.4 cannot be applied because we do not know if the measures γ_N have the strong hypercontractivity property with Gaussian constant $c = 1$; by the Theorem 4.2 they have it with $c = 2$ and we would obtain the weaker inequality (5.3). Instead, we will use the Proposition 4.6, the Theorem 4.1 and some results about strengthened versions of the DeMoivre–Laplace Central Limit Theorem, proved in the following subsection. This approach mirrors, to some extent, Gross's proof of the Gaussian log-Sobolev inequality in [9].

Remark 5.9. For the log–subharmonic functions $f(x) = e^{ax}, a > 0$ there is equality in (5.9) and (5.10). Thus the constant $c = 1$ is optimal in (5.9) and the constant $\frac{1}{2}$ is optimal in (5.10).

5.3. **Strengthened DeMoivre–Laplace Central Limit Theorems.**

Theorem 5.10. *Let X_n be independent, identically distributed Bernoulli random variables with $P(X_k = 0) = P(X_k = 1) = \frac{1}{2}$. Let*

$$S_n = \frac{X_1 + \ldots + X_n - \frac{n}{2}}{\frac{\sqrt{n}}{2}}$$

and let Y be an $N(0,1)$ random variable. Then for every continuous function f integrable with respect to the normal $N(0,1)$ law γ and such that $|f(x)| \leq e^{(\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)x^2}$ for some $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$, we have

$$\lim_n \mathbb{E}f(S_n) = \mathbb{E}f(Y).$$

Proof. Let $Y_k = 2X_k - 1$. We have $S_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} Y_k$. The independent random variables Y_k take the values 1 or -1 with probability $1/2$ and the Hoeffding inequality (see e.g. [5], Prop. 1.3.5) implies that

$$P(S_n > u) \leq e^{-u^2/2}. \tag{5.11}$$

Let $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{2}$ and $F_\epsilon(x) = \exp\{(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon)x^2\}$. It follows from (5.11) that

$$\mathbb{E}F_\epsilon(S_n) \ \rightarrow \ \mathbb{E}F_\epsilon(Y). \tag{5.12}$$

Indeed, since $P(F_\epsilon(S_n) > x) = 1$ for $x \leq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}F_\epsilon(S_n) = \int_0^\infty P(F_\epsilon(S_n) > x)dx = 1 + \int_1^\infty P(F_\epsilon(S_n) > x)dx.$$

In the last integral, change the variables $F_\epsilon(t) = x$. We obtain

$$\int_1^\infty P(F_\epsilon(S_n) > x)dx = \int_0^\infty F'_\epsilon(t)P(S_n > t)dt = (1 - 2\epsilon)\int_0^\infty tF_\epsilon(t)P(S_n > t)dt.$$

By the Central Limit Theorem we have $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(S_n > t) = P(Y > t)$. Using (5.11) and the Dominated Convergence Theorem we see that

$$\int_1^\infty P(F_\epsilon(S_n) > x)dx \ \rightarrow \ \int_1^\infty P(F_\epsilon(Y) > x)dx$$

and we conclude that (5.12) is true.

Now, let f be continuous and $0 \leq f \leq F_\epsilon$ for a fixed ϵ. Take $N > 0$. Decompose $\mathbb{E}(F_\epsilon(S_n)) = \mathbb{E}(F_\epsilon(S_n)\mathbf{1}_{\{|S_n| \leq N\}}) + \mathbb{E}(F_\epsilon(S_n)\mathbf{1}_{\{|S_n| > N\}})$. The Central Limit Theorem implies that

$$\mathbb{E}(F_\epsilon(S_n)\mathbf{1}_{\{|S_n| \leq N\}}) \ \rightarrow \ \mathbb{E}(F_\epsilon(Y)\mathbf{1}_{\{|Y| \leq N\}}).$$

Thus (5.12) and the integrability of F_ϵ with respect to the Gaussian law of Y imply that

$$\forall \delta > 0 \, \exists N > 0 \, \forall n \quad \mathbb{E}(F_\epsilon(S_n)\mathbf{1}_{\{|S_n|>N\}}) < \delta.$$

As $0 \le f \le F_\epsilon$, we have

$$\forall \delta > 0 \, \exists N > 0 \, \forall n \quad \mathbb{E}(f(S_n)\mathbf{1}_{\{|S_n|>N\}}) < \delta.$$

By the Central Limit Theorem, for every $N > 0$ we have $\mathbb{E}(f(S_n)\mathbf{1}_{\{|S_n|\le N\}}) \to \mathbb{E}(f(Y)\mathbf{1}_{\{|Y|\le N\}})$ and it follows that $\mathbb{E}(f(S_n)) \to \mathbb{E}(f(Y))$. ☐

In the sequel we denote by μ_n the law of S_n. Denote $\Psi(x) = P(Y > x)$ the tail function of the Gaussian distribution γ and $\Psi_n(x) = P(S_n > x)$ the tails of the random variables S_n.

Proposition 5.11. *If $g \in L^1(\gamma)$ is in $\mathcal{C}^1([0,\infty))$ and g is* **strictly increasing** *on $[x_0, \infty)$ for an $x_0 \ge 0$ then*

$$\int_{x_0}^{\infty} g \, d\gamma = g(x_0)\Psi(x_0) + \int_{x_0}^{\infty} g'\Psi dx. \tag{5.13}$$

In particular, $g'\Psi \in L^1(x_0,\infty)$. Equation 5.13 is also true with measures μ_n in the place of the Gaussian law γ:

$$\int_{x_0}^{\infty} g \, d\mu_n = g(x_0)\Psi_n(x_0) + \int_{x_0}^{\infty} g'\Psi_n dx, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{5.14}$$

Proof. In order to prove (5.13), we define Y^{x_0} as a bounded and positive random variable with law $\gamma|_{[x_0,\infty)}/\gamma([x_0,\infty))$. By Fubini's theorem we write

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\gamma([x_0,\infty))}\int_{x_0}^{\infty} g \, d\gamma \quad &= \mathbb{E}g(Y^{x_0}) = \int_0^{\infty} P(g(Y^{x_0}) > x) \, dx \\
&= \left(\int_0^{g(x_0)} + \int_{g(x_0)}^{\infty}\right) P(g(Y^{x_0}) > x) dx \\
&= g(x_0) + \int_{g(x_0)}^{\infty} P(g(Y^{x_0}) > x) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

The function g is a $\mathcal{C}^1$ bijection of $[x_0,\infty)$ onto $[g(x_0), G)$, where $G = \lim_{x\to\infty} g(x)$. In the last integral we change the variables $u = g^{-1}(x)$ and we obtain

$$\int_{g(x_0)}^{\infty} P(g(Y^{x_0}) > x)dx = \int_{g(x_0)}^{G} P(g(Y^{x_0}) > x)dx = \int_{x_0}^{\infty} P(Y^{x_0} > u)g'(u)du$$

and (5.13) follows. The proof for the symmetric binomial measures μ_n is analogous. ☐

Theorem 5.12. *If $g \in L^1(\gamma)$ is in $\mathcal{C}^1([0,\infty))$ and g is* **strictly increasing** *on $[x_0,\infty)$ for an $x_0 \ge 0$, then the DeMoivre–Laplace CLT holds for g and the subsequence $N = 4n^2$:*

$$\int_0^{\infty} g \, d\mu_N \quad \to \quad \int_0^{\infty} g \, d\gamma, \qquad N = 4n^2 \to \infty.$$

Proof. By the Central Limit Theorem $\int_0^{x_0} g \, d\mu_N \to \int_0^{x_0} g \, d\gamma$ and $\Psi_n(x) \to \Psi(x)$, $n \to \infty$. In order to establish the convergence of integrals on $[x_0,\infty)$, we begin with the formula (5.14). The convergence of the term $\int_{x_0}^{\infty} g'\Psi_N \, dx$ to $\int_{x_0}^{\infty} g'\Psi \, dx$ follows by the Dominated Convergence Theorem using Proposition 5.13 and the integrability of $g'\Psi$ with respect to Lebesgue measure on $[x_0,\infty)$. An application of (5.13) ends the proof. ☐

Proposition 5.13. *Let $x_0 > 0$. There exists $C > 0$ such that for all $x \ge x_0$ and $N = 4n^2$*

$$\Psi_N(x) = P(S_N > x) \le C \, P(Y > x) = C\Psi(x).$$

Remark 5.14. Proposition 5.13 strengthens the Hoeffding inequality (5.11). For our application, it is sufficient for us to prove it for a subsequence of n (here $4n^2$), but we conjecture that it is true for all n.

Proof. Let us denote $b(k,n,p) = \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k}$ and put $B(k,n,p) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{k} b(\nu, n, k)$. It is a standard exercise (cf. [6] Ex.VI.45(10.9)) to show that

$$1 - B(k,n,p) = n\binom{n-1}{k}\int_0^p t^k(1-t)^{n-k-1}\,dt.$$

We will show that if $p = \frac{1}{2}$ and $k = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} + \frac{x\sqrt{n}}{2} \rfloor$ then there exists a constant C such that for $x > x_0$ there holds $1 - B\left(k, n, \frac{1}{2}\right) \ < \ C\Psi(x)$. By the well-known estimate $\Psi(x) \sim \frac{1}{x}e^{-x^2/2}$ (see e.g. [6]VII, Lemma 2), it is enough to show that for $x > x_0$

$$1 - B\left(k, n, \frac{1}{2}\right) \ < \ \frac{C}{x}e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}.$$

In order to simplify the left–hand side of the last inequality we write

$$\frac{1 - B(k,n,\frac{1}{2})}{b(k,n,\frac{1}{2})} = \frac{n\binom{n-1}{k}\int_0^{1/2} t^k(1-t)^{n-k-1}\,dt}{\binom{n}{k}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^n} = (n-k)2^n\int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} t^k(1-t)^{n-k+1}\,dt,$$

so that it is enough to show that

$$b\left(k, n, \frac{1}{2}\right)(n-k)2^n\int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} t^k(1-t)^{n-k-1}\,dt \leq \frac{C}{x}e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}. \tag{5.15}$$

In order to further simplify the computations, from now on we take a subsequence $N = 4n^2$ instead of n, which gives $k = 2n^2 + \lfloor xn \rfloor$. For such k, Inequality 5.15 reads as

$$\binom{4n^2}{2n^2 + \lfloor xn \rfloor}(2n^2 - \lfloor xn \rfloor)\int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{2n^2+\lfloor xn \rfloor}(1-t)^{2n^2-\lfloor xn \rfloor-1}\,dt \leq \frac{C}{x}e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}. \tag{5.16}$$

First we estimate the integral. For $0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2}$ there holds $\big(t(1-t)\big)^{2n^2} \ < \ \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{2n^2}$. In order to estimate the integral $\int_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{t}{1-t}\right)^{\lfloor xn \rfloor}dt$ we use the Laplace method for estimating integrals of type $\int_a^b \exp\left(\lambda S(x)\right)\,dx$, when $\lambda \to \infty$, see e.g. [22]. We have to estimate

$$\int_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{t}{1-t}\right)^{\lfloor xn \rfloor}dt = \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{\lfloor xn \rfloor \ln\frac{t}{1-t}}\,dt,$$

hence we take $\lambda = \lfloor xn \rfloor$ and $S(t) = \ln\frac{t}{1-t}$. If $S(x)$ is $\mathcal{C}^\infty$, $\max_{x\in[a,b]} S(x)$ is attained only at b and $S'(b) \neq 0$ — all these conditions are fulfilled in our case — then, by Laplace method, for $\lambda \to \infty$, there holds $\int_a^b \exp\left(\lambda S(x)\right)\,dx \ \sim \ \frac{1}{\lambda S'(b)}$, which in our case gives for some constant C_1 and $x > x_0$

$$\int_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{t}{1-t}\right)^{\lfloor xn \rfloor}dt \leq \frac{C_1}{xn}.$$

Finally, since $(1-t)^{-1} \leq 2$ on this interval, we get

$$\int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{2n^2+\lfloor xn \rfloor}(1-t)^{2n^2-\lfloor xn \rfloor-1}\,dt \leq \frac{2C_1}{xn}\left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{2n^2}.$$

Substituting this estimate into (5.15), we see that it is enough to prove the following inequality: there exists a constant C_2 such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $x \in [x_0,\ 2n]$ there holds

$$\frac{2n^2 - \lfloor xn \rfloor}{n}\binom{4n^2}{2n^2 + \lfloor xn \rfloor}\left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{2n^2} \leq C_2 e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}.$$

If $x \in [x_0,\ 2n]$, then $m = \lfloor xn \rfloor \in \left[\lfloor x_0 n \rfloor,\ 2n^2\right]$, hence it is enough to show that for all $m = 1, 2, ..., 2n^2$ there holds

$$\frac{2n^2 - m}{n}\binom{4n^2}{2n^2 + m}\left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{2n^2} \leq C_2 e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}.$$

But, if $m = \lfloor xn \rfloor$, then $xn - 1 < m \le xn,$ hence $x - \frac{1}{n} < \frac{m}{n} \le x$ and $x < \frac{m+1}{n}$, which implies $e^{-\frac{(m+1)^2}{2n^2}} < e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}$. Taking this into account, we see that it is enough to prove that for all n and $m = 1, 2, ..., 2n^2$

$$\frac{2n^2 - m}{n} \binom{4n^2}{2n^2 + m} \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{2n^2} \le C_2 e^{-\frac{(m+1)^2}{2n^2}}. \tag{5.17}$$

We estimate from the above the left-hand side of (5.17), using the Stirling formula

$$N! = N^N\, e^{-N} \sqrt{2\pi N}\, \exp\{\theta_N\},$$

where $\theta_N \in (0, 1)$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2n^2 - m}{n} \binom{4n^2}{2n^2 + m} \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{2n^2} &= \frac{(2n^2 - m)}{n} \frac{(4n^2)!}{(2n^2 + m)!(2n^2 - m)!} \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{2n^2} \\ &\le \frac{2e}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{2n^2 - m}{2n^2 + m}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{4n^4}{4n^4 - m^2}\right)^{2n^2} \left(\frac{2n^2 - m}{2n^2 + m}\right)^{m}. \end{aligned}$$

We see that (5.17) will follow from an estimate

$$\left(\frac{4n^4}{4n^4 - m^2}\right)^{2n^2} \left(\frac{2n^2 - m}{2n^2 + m}\right)^{m + \frac{1}{2}} \le C_3 e^{-\frac{(m+1)^2}{2n^2}}$$

for some C_3 and $m = 1, 2, ..., 2n^2$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{4n^4}{4n^4 - m^2}\right)^{2n^2} \left(\frac{2n^2 - m}{2n^2 + m}\right)^{m + \frac{1}{2}} &= \left(1 - \frac{m^2}{4n^4}\right)^{-2n^2} \left(\frac{1 - \frac{m}{2n^2}}{1 + \frac{m}{2n^2}}\right)^{m + \frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \exp\left(-2n^2 \ln\left(1 - \frac{m^2}{4n^4}\right) + (m + 1/2) \ln \frac{1 - \frac{m}{2n^2}}{1 + \frac{m}{2n^2}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

so that we have to prove that for all n and $m = 1, 2, ..., 2n^2$ and some constant $C_4 = \ln C_3$

$$-2n^2 \ln\left(1 - \frac{m^2}{4n^4}\right) + (m + 1/2) \ln \frac{1 - \frac{m}{2n^2}}{1 + \frac{m}{2n^2}} \le C_4 - \frac{(m+1)^2}{2n^2}. \tag{5.18}$$

Observe that if $m = 2n^2$, then the left-hand side of (5.17) is zero and then (5.17) is obviously true. For $m = 1, 2, ..., 2n^2 - 1$ the quantity $t = \frac{m}{2n^2}$ is positive and strictly less then one, so that we can use the Taylor series expansions for $|t| < 1$ and the functions $\ln(1 - t^2)$, $\ln(1 + t)$, and $\ln(1 - t)$. After some tedious but elementary computations one finds that the left-hand side ℓ of (5.18) has the form $\ell = -\frac{m^2+m}{2n^2} + R(n, m)$ where $R(n, m) = \sum a_j(n) m^j$ is negative, because all the coefficients $a_j(n)$ are negative. Now, the inequality $\ell \le C_4 - \frac{(m+1)^2}{2n^2}$ obviously follows because $-\frac{m^2+m}{2n^2} + \frac{(m+1)^2}{2} = \frac{m+1}{2n^2} \le 1.$ □

5.4. **Proofs of Gaussian Log–Sobolev Inequalities.** We are now ready to prove the Theorems 5.7 and 5.8. We present, with details, the proof in the more natural L^1 case.

Proof of Theorem 5.8. By Theorem 5.2 we know that for all n and $f \in \mathcal{C}^1$

$$\int f \log f \, d\mu_n - \|f\|_{1,\mu_n} \log \|f\|_{1,\mu_n} \le \frac{1}{2} \int Ef \, d\mu_n, \tag{5.19}$$

where μ_n is the convolved Bernoulli measure considered in the previous section. We want to show that the Central Limit Theorem with $n = (2k)^2$ applies to all the three terms of the formula (5.19).

It is sufficient to show that the integrals $\int_0^\infty h \, d\mu_n$ restricted to $[0, \infty)$ converge to $\int_0^\infty h \, d\gamma$ for $h = f \log f, f$ and Ef. Indeed, using the notation $\tilde{f}(x) = f(-x)$, if f and $\log f$ are convex, so are $\tilde{f}$ and $\log \tilde{f}$, so f being log-subharmonic is equivalent to $\tilde{f}$ being log-subharmonic. The property $E\tilde{f}(x) = -xf'(-x)$ shows that on the right–hand side of (5.19) and (5.10) we have

$\int_{-\infty}^{0} Ef(x)d\mu(x) = \int_{0}^{\infty} E\tilde{f}(x)d\mu(x)$.

First term. The function $\log f$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$ and convex, so it is monotone in a segment $[x_0, \infty)$.

- If $\lim_{x\to\infty} \log f(x) = c$ is finite, then $\log f$ is bounded on $[x_0, \infty)$ and therefore f is bounded. Thus $f \log f$ is bounded on $[x_0, \infty)$ and on $[0, \infty)$. The convergence $\int f \log f \, d\mu_n \to \int f \log f \, d\gamma$ then follows from the CLT.
- If $\lim_{x\to\infty} \log f(x) = -\infty$, then $\lim_{x\to\infty} f = 0$ and $\lim_{x\to\infty} f \log f = 0$. As in the preceding case, the convergence $\int f \log f \, d\mu_n \to \int f \log f \, d\gamma$ follows from the CLT.
- In the case $\lim_{x\to\infty} \log f(x) = +\infty$, the function $\log f$ is increasing on $[x_0, \infty)$, thus f is also increasing on $[x_0, \infty)$. We can suppose that $\log f > 0$ on $[x_0, \infty)$(otherwise we choose x_0 bigger). Consequently $f \log f$ is increasing on $[x_0, \infty)$. If f is not constant, the functions f and $f \log f$ are strictly increasing. We can then apply Proposition 5.12.

Second term. As a positive convex function, f is bounded on $\mathbb{R}^+$ or strictly increasing on an interval $[x_0, \infty)$. The convergence $\int f \, d\mu_n \to \int f \, d\gamma$ follows respectively from the CLT or from Proposition 5.12.

Third term. The function f' is increasing. Therefore, if f achieves any positive values then $f' > 0$ on a certain interval $[x_0, \infty)$. As the function x is strictly increasing, so is the function xf' on $[x_0, \infty)$ and we apply Proposition 5.12. If, on the other hand, $f' \leq 0$ on $[0, \infty)$, then there exists a constant C such that $|f'| \leq C$ on $\mathbb{R}^+$. Consequently $|Ef(x)| \leq Cx$ on $\mathbb{R}^+$ and the convergence $\int_0^\infty Ef \, d\mu_n \to \int_0^\infty Ef \, d\gamma$ follows from the Theorem 5.10. □

Proof of Theorem 5.7. The proof is the same as the proof of Theorem 5.8, with f^2 instead of f. In particular, for the convergence of the third integral $\int fEf \, d\mu_n$, we have $fEf = \frac{1}{2}E(f^2)$ and the reasoning from the proof of Theorem 5.8 applies. □

Remark 5.15. The preceding techniques clearly only apply in the one-dimensional setting. With the techniques in this paper, we cannot address the question of whether the stronger (constant $1/2$) Logarithmic Sobolev inequality of Theorems 5.8 and 5.7 hold for Gaussian measures in higher dimensions. In principle, they should follow from the strong hypercontractivity inequalities of Theorem 3.2 via an approach like that in the proof of Theorem 5.2. As we have mentioned, there are challenging regularization issues (due to the nature of logarithmically subharmonic functions) which complicate these techniques. Along the same lines, any measure for which the Logarithmic Sobolev Inequality holds for LSH functions should also satisfy strong hypercontractive estimates (this was proved in the restricted context of holomorphic functions in [10]). These issues will be dealt with in a future publication.

REFERENCES

[1] Ané, C. et al: *Sur les inégalités de Sobolev logarithmiques.* Panoramas et Synthèses, **10**, Société mathématique de France, 2000.

[2] Bonami, A.: *Etude des coefficients de Fourier de $L^p(G)$.* Ann. de l'Institut Fourier, **20**, 1971, 335-402.

[3] Carlen, E. : *Some integral identities and inequalities for entire functions and their applications to the coherent state transform.* J. Funct. Anal., **97** 1991, 231–249.

[4] Dudley, R.: *Real analysis and probability.* Revised reprint of the 1989 original. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 74. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

[5] Dudley, R.: *Uniform Central Limit Theorems.* Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 63. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[6] Feller, W.: *An introduction to probability theory and its applications.* Vol. I. Third edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York-London-Sydney 1968.

[7] Graczyk, P.; Loeb, J.; Lopez, I.; Nowak, A.; Urbina, W.: *Higher order Riesz Transforms, fractional derivatives, and Sobolev spaces for Laguerre expansions.* Journal Math. Pures et Appl., **84**, 2005, 375 - 405.

[8] Galaz-Fontes, F.; Gross, L.; Sontz, S.: *Reverse hypercontractivity over manifolds.* Ark. Math., **39** 2001, 283-309.

[9] Gross, L.: *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities.* Amer. J. Math. **97** 1975, 1061-1083.

[10] Gross, L.: *Hypercontractivity over complex manifolds*, Acta Mathematica, **182,2**, 2000, 159-206.

[11] Gross, L.: *Strong hypercontractivity and relative subharmonicity.* Special issue dedicated to the memory of I. E. Segal. J. Funct. Anal. **190** 2002, 38–92.

[12] Gross, L. *Hypercontractivity, logarithmic Sobolev inequalities, and applications: a survey of surveys. Diffusion, quantum theory, and radically elementary mathematics*, 45–73, Math. Notes,**47**, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 2006.
[13] Gross, L.; Grothaus, M.: *Reverse hypercontractivity for subharmonic functions.* Canad. J. Math. **57** 2005, 506-534.
[14] Gutiérrez, C.; Incognito, A.; Torrea, J.: *Riesz transforms, g-functions, and multipliers for the Laguerre semigroup.* Houston J. Math. **2** 2001, 579–592.
[15] Haagerup, U.: *The best constants in the Khintchine inequality.* Studia Math. **70** 1981, no. 3, 231–283.
[16] Hormander, L.: *Complex analysis in several variables.* North Holland, American Elsevier, 1973.
[17] Janson, S.: *On hypercontractivity for multipliers of orthogonal polynomials.* Ark. Mat, **21**1983, 97-110.
[18] Janson, S.: *On complex hypercontractivity.* J. Funct. Anal., **151** 1997, 270–280.
[19] Kemp, T.: *Hypercontractivity in non-commutative holomorphic spaces.* Commun. Math. Phys. **259** 2005, 615-637.
[20] Kemp, T.; Loeb, J.J.: *Strong logarithmic Sobolev inequalities for log-subharmonic functions.* Preprint.
[21] Nelson, E.: *The free Markov field.* J. Funct. Anal., **12** 1973, 211-227.
[22] Olver, F. W. J.: *Asymptotics and special functions.* Academic Press, New York - London, 1974.
[23] Sadullaev, A.; Madrakhimov, R.: *Smoothness of subharmonic functions.* (Russian) Mat. Sb. 181 (1990), no. 2, 167–182; translation in Math. USSR-Sb. 69 (1991), no. 1, 179–195
[24] Zhou, Z.: *The contractivity of the free Hamiltonian semigroup in the L_p space of entire functions.* J. Funct. Anal., **96** 1991, 407–425.
[25] Zygmund, A.: *Trigonometric series*, Vol. I, II. Reprint of the 1979 edition. Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988.

(1) UNIVERSITÉ D'ANGERS, 2 BOULEVARD LAVOISIER, 49045 ANGERS CEDEX 01, FRANCE
E-mail address: `Piotr.Graczyk@univ-angers.fr,Jean-Jacques.Loeb@univ-angers.fr`

(2) 2-175, MIT 77 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, CAMBRDIGE, MA 02139
E-mail address: `tkemp@math.mit.edu`

(3) INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, WROCLAW UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, 50–370 W. WYSPIANSKIEGO, WROCLAW, POLAND
E-mail address: `Tomasz.Zak@pwr.wroc.pl`